BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY
3 1761 10083564 4

U of T
LAW
LIBRARY

LIBRARY USE ONLY

LAW LIBRARY
AUG 02 1972
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Fine Binding

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/casesreadingsonp00unse

2
KF7022
723

CASES AND READINGS ON PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

COMPILED BY JOHN WILLIS
FOR USE BY HIS CLASS IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN THE FACULTY OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1971

LAW LIBRARY
SEP - 8 1971
FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Acq. 18
Aug 1923

CASES AND READINGS ON PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE. Introductory generalities: Administrative Law; Statutory discretions; from the point of view of the government; from the point of view of the individual; public attitudes.

What is administrative law?	Preface - 1
Administrative law in Canada.	Preface - 3
Methods of translating policy into action through law; a seminar proposal.	Preface - 5
Discretions; a practical example, the Ontario Securities Commission.	Preface - 7
Discretions; the why's and wherefore's	Preface - 11
Discretions; "confining, structuring and checking".	Preface - 14
Discretions; police and prosecutor discretion.	Preface - 23
Safeguards; The McRuer Report.	Preface - 25
A criticism of the McRuer Report.	Preface - 31
Newspaper criticisms of discretions and their exercise.	Preface - 33

Section 1. Four great cases; herein of many things but principally of statute interpretation and of judicial review of administrative discretion.

1. THE WHEAT BOARD CASE

(a) <u>The real life facts</u>.

Extract from an article, "The Nolan Case".	1 - 1

(b) <u>The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada</u>

Canadian Wheat Board v. Nolan.	1 - 5

(c) <u>The decision of the Privy Council</u>.

Attorney-General for Canada v Hallett & Carey	1 - 15

(d) The statute interpretation mess; herein of many things; including the rule against legislative history and a possible compromise solution.

The views of Kenneth Culp Davis on legislative history and the Nolan Case. 1 - 19

A famous, and influential, note by Professor Laski suggesting a compromise solution. 1 - 27

Comment by John Willis on the decision of the Supreme Court in the Nolan Case. 1 - 30

A note on governmental ethics. 1 - 35a

Retrospective reversal of court decisions. 1 - 35a

Comment by D. A. MacGibbon on the decision of the Supreme Court and on the decision of the Privy Council in the Nolan Case. 1 - 36

(e) Some fundamental issues raised by the Nolan Case, including the role of courts and lawyers in twentieth century government, changing attitudes towards the age-old problem of public claims versus private claims and many other things.

Correspondence between Messrs. Kent Power, Fillmore and Willis on some of the issues raised by the Willis comment reproduced at p. 30 above. 1 - 40

2. THE RONCARELLI CASE

(a) The case itself.

Roncarelli v Duplessis. 1 - 53

(a_1) Another cause celebre in the licence revocation field.

Hlookoff v City of Vancouver ("the Georgia Straight Case"). 1 - 59a

(a_2) On what grounds, as a legislative matter, should a licensing authority be allowed to refuse or revoke a licence?

The comments of a Yale professor. 1 - 59g

The views of the McRuer Report. 1 - 59i

(b) The statute interpretation point; how the courts get around wide words such as "The Commission may cancel any permit at its discretion"; three professional reactions to this aspect of the judicial process.

A Canadian academic's reaction to Roncarelli 1 - 59n

An English academic's reaction to Robert's v Hopwood. 1 - 61

Another Canadian academic's views on what we ought to do about it.

(c) The tort point; in improperly revoking Roncarelli's licence what common law tort did Archambault and/or Duplessis commit so as to render Duplessis liable to pay him damages?

Extract from an article on liability in tort of judicial officers. 1 - 63a

Asoka Kumar David v Abdul Cader. 1 - 66

Note on the unsatisfactory state of the present law where public authorities have, in the absence of legislation, the same rights and liabilities as private individuals. 1 - 67a

(d) A consideration in the context of the tort liability of public officers, of (i) the weasel concept "judicial" and (ii) the weasel concept "jurisdiction".

(i) The weasel concept "judicial".

A note on "judicial functions". 1 - 67a

O'Connor v Waldron. 1 - 68

Everett v Griffiths. 1 - 70

(ii) The weasel concept "jurisdiction".

A comment on the concept of "jurisdiction". 1 - 71

Harris v Law Society of Alberta. 1 - 72

3. THE COMMUNIST CASE

Smith & Rhuland Limited v The Queen. 1 - 77

Comment by Professor Friedmann on judicial policy-making in labour relations. 1 - 83

Comment by Professor Wade on Professor Kenneth Culp Davis' strictures on the attitude of the English to judicial policy-making. 1 - 85

4. THE CATCHMENT BOARD CASE.

East Suffolk Rivers Catchment Board v Kent. 1 - 88

Lord Denning on the case. 1 - 92

Professor Friedmann on the case. 1 - 93

A note on the case of the escaping Borstal boys (Home Office v Dorset Yacht) and its implications. 1 - 95

Revesz v Commonwealth of Australia (Bureaucratic Negligence). 1 - 97

Two adverse comments on Revesz. 1 - 98

SECTION 2. The minimum procedural decencies.

(a) Judicial control of administrative procedure - general considerations.

The common law bill of rights and its origin - extract from John Willis article. 2 - 1

The Canadian Bill of Rights and a comment on it by R. M. Jackson. 2 - 4

Maclean v The Workers Union. 2 - 8

Comments by Professor Bernard Schwarz on Board of Education v Rice and the Arlidge Case. 2 - 11

(b) Certiorari and right to a hearing; judicial functions.

(i) "Finality"

Guay v Lafleur. 2 - 13

Re Pergamon Press. 2 - 19

The powers of the income tax police; a comment by Professor Huberman. 2 - 22

R v Botting. 2 - 23

(ii) The "audi alteram partem" principle; the "exercising 'judicial' [as opposed to administrative'] functions" principle; the uncertainty as to the scope and limits of each; and the uncertainty as to which of the two principles (the scope and limits of each being in any event uncertain) a court will use in deciding any given case on "do the principles of natural justice apply" or "does certiorari lie".

Cooper v. Wandsworth Board of Works. 2 - 26

Administrative or Judicial? A basic analysis by J.A. Corry. 2 - 28

Re Brown and Brock. 2 - 32

Lee Wing v Peter Don Chang. 2 - 35

Calgary Power v Copithorne. 2 - 38

Ridge v Baldwin. 2 - 42

Comment by de Smith on Ridge v Baldwin. 2 - 48

A comment from India on the administrative-judicial dichotomy and its bearing on the right to the minimum procedural decencies. 2 - 49

(bb) The legislative approach; when should the citizen have a legal right to put his point of view and to what kind of a hearing should he be entitled?

The McRuer Report on expropriation procedure. 2 - 51

The McRuer Report on licence refusal and revocation procedure. 2 - 53

(c) Bias.

Application of the bias principle to regulatory authorities; what is the problem? A comment by R. F. Reid. 2 - 56

Re Township of York By-law. 2 - 57

Re Stoller. 2 - 60

Bias in the disciplinary tribunal of a regulatory authority; a comment by R. F. Reid. 2 - 64

Bias in the tripartite tribunal - labour relations boards; a comment by Professor Harry Arthurs. 2 - 65

Franklin v Minister of Town Planning. 2 - 67

(cc) Bias - a glance at "the what actually happens" as opposed to "the law".

The what actually happens of "bias" in the Ontario Labour Relations Board; the views of its first chairman. 2 - 70

The what actually happens of "bias" in regulatory authorities generally; the views of an American political scientist. 2 - 71

(d) Nature of hearing required.

R v Pantelidis. 2 - 74

A dissenting opinion on the validity of the rule that the accused doesn't have to go into the box. 2 - 78

Right to counsel; Enderby Town Football Club v. The Football Association. 2 - 79

Right to cross-examination; St. John v Fraser . 2 - 80

The McRuer Report's views on the procedural rights of those affected by the exercise of investigating powers. 2 - 83

The Globe and Mail case. 2 - 85

The legislative solution of the problem posed in the Globe and Mail case. 2 - 88

Official Solicitor v K. 2 - 91

Administrative secrecy; the views of Professor A. S. Abel. 2 - 94

Administrative secrecy; the rule adopted in the new Federal Court Bill. 2 - 96

Perepolkin v Superintendent of Child Welfare. 2 - 96

The rules of evidence and natural justice; an unsigned case note from the Law Quarterly Review. 2 - 102

The effect of disregarding a procedural provision prescribed by statute: R. v McDevitt. 2 - 103

The same: R. v Steeves. 2 - 104

(f) A comment on the panorama of "natural justice".

Why the cases on "natural justice" are confused and uncertain; the views of John Willis. 2 - 106

Some general problems of a procedural nature that face the Ontario Securities Commission, a fairly typical regulatory authority. 2 - 109

The new McRuer inspired Statutory Powers Procedure Bill (Spring 1969). 2 - 110

A critical comment by R. F. Reid on the Bill and the attitudes behind it. 2 - 114

SECTION 3. Statute interpretation; exercises in manipulating the words of an act or a regulation.

(a) General considerations.

The views of Roscoe Pound. 3 - 1

"Intention of the Legislature" - the views of the House of Lords. 3 - 2

The "liberal approach": Lord Denning in Seaford Estates v Asher. 3 - 2

The "literal approach": Lord Simonds in the Magor Case. 3 - 4

A comment by a political scientist. 3 - 5

(b) The grammatical rules of construction - study the technique of using them but do not take them seriously.

R. v Rouse - is milk a beverage? 3 - 6

The Supreme Court of the United States on "is a tomato a fruit or a vegetable?" and the comments of Thurman Arnold thereon. 3 - 9

United Towns Electric Co. v A-G Newfoundland. 3 - 11

(c) Some typical statute interpretation cases - assigned as exercises.

R. v Jones. 3 - 13

James v Commonwealth of Australia. 3 - 15

R. v Williamson. 3 - 16

(d) The statutory "purpose rule" versus the common law presumptions.

1. General considerations.

Interpretation Act, Section 10. 3 - 18

The common law presumptions. 3 - 18

2. The Bachand case and Liversidge v Anderson.

(a) The Bachand case.

Case comment by R. M. Willes Chitty. 3 - 19

Re Bachand v Dupuis. 3 - 22

(b) The Liversidge case.

Liversidge v Sir John Anderson. 3 - 26

Nakkuda Ali v Jayaratne (Extract). 3 - 34

Comment by Lord Chorley. 3 - 35

Comment by Sir Arthur Goodhart. 3 - 36

3. Privative clauses: direct and indirect.

A comment by the McRuer Report. 3 - 38

How the courts evade direct ones: a comment by Professor Wade. 3 - 39

How the courts evade indirect ones; a comment by G. Ganz. 3 - 40

(e) A recent problem case, an amusing spoof and a recent authoritative comment on the whole statute interpretation problem.

The Breathalyzer Reference: extract from an article by Philip Stenning. 3 - 44

R. v Ojibway: a spoof by two members of the class of 1965. 3 - 54

A final and authoritative comment on the process of statute interpretation: Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations by the U. K. Law Commission. 3 - 56

SECTION 4. Judicial control over the merits of administrative action; general principles governing the exercise of all statutory powers to decide.

Principle No. 1. Duty to exercise the discretion personally - delegation - acting on the order of, or by agreement with, or in an attempt to second-guess, others.

Extracts from an article on "Delegatus non potest delegare" by John Willis. 4 - 1

(a) The Cabinet.

Reference Re Regulations (Chemicals) under War Measures Act. 4 - 4

The political ideas competing for recognition in the Chemicals case: comment by John Willis. 4 - 8

A-G of Canada v Brent. 4 - 8a

(b) Municipal Councils - licensing systems.

R v Sepanary. 4 - 10

R v Campbell. 4 - 11

Re Davies and Village of Forest Hill. 4 - 12

The political ideas competing for recognition in the Forest Hill Swimming Pool case. 4 - 14

Mills v London County Council. 4 - 15

(c) Administrative Boards.

Allingham v Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. 4 - 16

Labour Relations Board of Saskatchewan v Speers. 4 - 18

(d) Ministers (or, in plain English, civil service departments).

Yasny v Lapointe. 4 - 22

Lewisham Borough Council v Roberts. 4 - 26

Does the alter ego principle applicable to civil service departments apply to the municipal civil service or to police departments. 4 - 28

Wrights' Ropes Limited v Minister of National Revenue. 4 - 30

(e) Acting on the orders of another.

Note by Professor Robson on the Simms Motor Units Case. 4 - 31

R v Stepney Corporation. 4 - 34

Principle No. 2. Duty to exercise legislative discretion generally and judicial discretion specifically.

(a) Legislative discretion - herein also of "discriminatory" and "uncertain" by-laws.

Verdun v Sun Oil Co. Ltd. 4 - 36

Re Smeaton and Shoal Lake Village By-Law. 4 - 38

S.S. Kresge Co. Ltd. v City of Windsor. 4 - 40

Re Joy Oil Co. Ltd. v City of Toronto. 4 - 41

City of Toronto v Polai. 4 - 44

Re Bruce and Town of Cobourg. 4 - 44b

Fawcett Properties v Buckingham County Council. 4 - 45

(b) Judicial discretion - "having a policy".

R. v Torquay Licensing Justices. 4 - 47

British Oxygen Co. Ltd. v Minister of Technology. 4 - 50

Principle No. 3. Duty to exercise the discretion honestly - "discrimination", "favouritism" and "private interest" in municipal affairs.

Re Howard and City of Toronto. 4 - 52

Metropolitan Stores Limited v The city of Hamilton. 4 - 53

Principle No. 4. Duty to exercise the discretion for the purpose for which it was granted and for no other purpose - "collateral motives". Duty to decide the question of fact or question of law entrusted to the tribunal and no other question - "extraneous circumstances" - "irrelevant considerations". The thin line dividing "irrelevant considerations" from "wrong decision of law" from "wrong decision of policy" and from "wrong decision of fact".

(a) "Collateral motives" and "extraneous or irrelevant considerations" in general.

Professor de Smith on "abuse of statutory powers" 4 - 56

Orpen v Attorney-General for Ontario. 4 - 57

Shawn v Robertson. 4 - 61

(b) Extraneous considerations "distinguished" from wrong decision on law.

R v Agricultural Land Tribunal. 4 - 65

Case Comment by D.M. Gordon on the Globe and Mail case in the Supreme Court. 4 - 67

(c) Extraneous considerations "distinguished" from wrong decision on policy.

The Wednesbury case. 4 - 70

The Singapore slum clearance case. 4 - 73

Evans v Collins. 4 - 77

(d) Deciding without sufficient evidence "distinguished" from "denial of natural justice" and from "wrong decision on collateral matters".

The King v Nat Bell Liquors. 4 - 79

Re Nelson. 4 - 80

The McRuer Report on "preliminary matters" and "collateral matters". 4 - 81

Parkhill Bedding v International Molders. 4 - 83

Postcript

A comment by John Willis on the McRuer Report's recommendation that the court's power to interfere with the merits of a public authority's decisions be extended. 4 - 88

A note on statutory appeals. 4 - 89

Currie v Commissioners of Inland Revenue. 4 - 91

Re City of Portage La Prairie. 4 - 92

SECTION 5. The background of administrative law.

Topic No. 1. The Twentieth century constitution; delegated legislation; administrative tribunals.

(i) Generalities

Why the eighteenth century constitution that is embalmed in the law books and enshrined in the hearts of lawyers has had to give way to the twentieth century constitution we find operating in real life; the views of Professor J. A. Corry (1941). 5 - 1

The problem: how to carry out the functions of twentieth century government in accordance with the basic principles underlying the eighteenth century constitution; the need for delegation; the views of the Gordon Report (Ontario, 1959). 5 - 5

Delegated legislation; ad hoc decision by an administrative authority; the problem of political and legal theory; comments by Professor George Nicholls (1964). 5 - 8

Delegated legislation; ad hoc decision by an administrative authority; the practical problem; extract from Baker, Policy by Rule or ad hoc Approach - Which should it be? (1957) 5 - 9

(ii) Delegated Legislation.

Why delegated legislation; the views of a distinguished English "public economist" in a famous article written fifty years ago (1924). 5 - 13

The necessity of delegated legislation; an authoritative and contemporary Canadian review of the subject (1969). 5 - 15

"The Bypass Way of Lawmaking"; a criticism founded on some statements in the McRuer Report of some aspects of delegated legislation in Ontario; a newspaper piece, headed by the above provocative title and a photograph of McRuer looking particularly stern (1968). 5 - 20

Safeguards in delegated legislation; a general review of the position in Canada by a Canadian law teacher (1964). 5 - 22

Safeguards in delegated legislation in Canada; publication of regulations; parliamentary scrutiny; a comment on post-World War II developments by a Canadian political scientist (1953). 5 - 24

(iii) Administrative Tribunals: "Boards"

That weasel word "Boards": a survey by Professor J. A. Corry of the very different types of Canadian public authority called by that name (1941). 5 - 29

Canadian "quasi-judicial" boards; three important ones; what they do and why; John Willis (1956). 5 - 33

Regulatory boards; their main characteristics; an editorial note in Gellhorn and Byse, Administrative Law, Cases and Comments (1970 Edition). 5 - 37

One practising lawyer's attitude to Canadian regulatory boards; R.F. Reid (1960). 5 - 38

Another practising lawyer's attitude to Canadian regulatory boards; D. Gordon Blair (1967). 5 - 47

Safeguards: possible methods of reviewing decisions in individual cases given by administrative tribunals; given a choice between administrative review and judicial review, which should it be when; the views of Professor A.S. Abel (1962). 5 - 54

(iv) Two minority comments on currently popular moves for law reform in the administrative law field.

The psychology behind the McRuer Report's dream of confining administrative discretion and its attempt to turn administrative tribunals into little courts; Witty and enduring comments by the redoubtable Thurman Arnold (1935). 5 - 59

An attack before the event on the McRuer Report's disregard of "what actually happens", its overemphasis on individual rights, its thinking up of new ways, of breathing down the necks of civil servants, its "all purpose" or "scatter-gun" technique and its "foreign borrowings"; John Willis (1965). 5 - 62

Topic No. 2. Discretions; methods of control; the Ombudsman.

A note on the ambiguity of the word "discretion"; Professor Alan Mewett (1970). 5 - 68

Confining, structuring and checking the prosecuting power; the views of Professor Kenneth Culp Davis in the most important book, for many years in the field of administrative law (1969). 5 - 69

Controlling tax avoidance; "ministerial discretion"; the views of the Carter Commission (1966). 5 - 77

The Ombudsman; an admirer's account of him; Professor Geoffrey Sawer (1967). 5 - 79

The Ombudsman: a doubters account of him; John Willis (1970). 5 - 83

Topic No. 3. Translating policy into action; extra-legal enforcement tactics; some problems of law enforcement; the criminal sanction; the licensing method; questions to ask yourself.

Sanctions; the problem; extract from Landis' famous "The Administrative Process" (1938). 5 - 86

Ways of controlling action without recourse to legal sanctions. 5 - 87

Legal Sanctions; general considerations; A radio talk given by John Willis in Halifax, Nova Scotia in 1940 or thereabouts. 5 - 88

The criminal sanction; some prerequisites to its effectiveness; Extract from Howard and Summers, Law, its nature, functions and limits, pp. 46-47 (1965). 5 - 92

The limits of the criminal sanction; the case of anti-drug legislation; Peter McWilliams, The Formidable Cost of Enforcing Marijuana Laws, Globe and Mail, December 31, 1i70. 5 - 94

The Licensing method; its advantages and disadvantages; Street Justice in the Welfare State pp. 69-79 (1968). 5 - 98

Some questions and a problem for you to wrestle with. 5 - 104